

Braille Monitor



JULY, 1983

VOICE OF THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE BLIND

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2010 with funding from
National Federation of the Blind (NFB)

<http://www.archive.org/details/braillemonitorjuly83nati>

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE BLIND

MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION FORM

The National Federation of the Blind has chapters in all fifty states and in almost every local community in the nation. The Federation has more than 50,000 members and is working to help the blind to have full and meaningful lives. It is not financed by the government but depends for support on contributions from its Members, and its Friends.

I support the National Federation of the Blind and herewith pay one dollar for Membership-at-large in the organization. As a Member-at-large I wish to make a tax-deductible contribution for the year _____ in the amount of:

- Associate—\$10
- Contributing Associate—\$25
- Supporting Associate—\$50
- Sponsoring Associate—\$100
- Sustaining Associate—\$500
- Member of the President's Club—\$1,000
- Other

(Please type or print legibly.)

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Telephone _____ Date _____

Representative of the National Federation of the Blind:
(Name) _____ (State) _____

This application and accompanying check made payable to **National Federation of the Blind** should be sent to:

Richard Edlund, Treasurer
National Federation of the Blind
1800 Johnson Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21230



RECEIPT

Received of _____

the amount of _____ dollars. Date _____

Signature of representative of the National Federation of the Blind

(All contributions to the National Federation of the Blind are tax-deductible.)

THE BRAILLE MONITOR

PUBLISHED MONTHLY IN INKPRINT, BRAILLE, AND ON TALKING BOOK DISCS BY
THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE BLIND

KENNETH JERNIGAN, *President*

NATIONAL OFFICE
1800 JOHNSON STREET
BALTIMORE, MARYLAND 21230

LETTERS FOR THE PRESIDENT, ADDRESS CHANGES,
SUBSCRIPTION REQUESTS, AND ORDERS FOR NFB LITERATURE.
ARTICLES FOR THE MONITOR AND LETTERS TO THE EDITOR
SHOULD BE SENT TO THE NATIONAL OFFICE

* * *

MONITOR SUBSCRIPTIONS COST THE FEDERATION ABOUT FIFTEEN DOLLARS PER YEAR. MEMBERS
ARE INVITED, AND NON-MEMBERS ARE REQUESTED, TO COVER THE SUBSCRIPTION COST. DONA-
TIONS SHOULD BE MADE PAYABLE TO NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE BLIND AND SENT TO

RICHARD EDLUND, *Treasurer*
NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE BLIND
BOX 11185
KANSAS CITY, KANSAS 66111

* * *

If you or a friend would like to remember the National Federation of the Blind in your
will, you can do so by employing the following language:

"I give, devise, and bequeath unto National Federation of the Blind, a District of Columbia
nonprofit corporation, the sum of \$____ (or "____ percent of my net estate" or
"the following stocks and bonds: ____") to be used for its worthy purposes on behalf of
blind persons."

* * *

**THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE BLIND IS NOT AN ORGANIZATION
SPEAKING FOR THE BLIND — IT IS THE BLIND SPEAKING FOR THEMSELVES**

ISSN 0006-8829

THE BRAILLE MONITOR

PUBLICATION OF THE
NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE BLIND

JULY 1983

CONTENTS

A CONVERSATION WITH MILI	215
by Joyce Scanlan	
LETTER FROM THE FIRST LADY OF ECUADOR	217
BLIND JUROR RECOGNIZED AS LEADER	218
by Sharon Gold	
DIANE McGEORGE SENDS A LETTER TO UNITED AIRLINES	219
UNITED AIRLINES REPLIES TO DIANE McGEORGE	221
KEN VOLONTE WRITES TO PACIFIC EXPRESS AIRLINES	222
RIPLEY'S MAKES A POSITIVE REPLY	223
THE TOWEL TEST	224
by Kenneth Jernigan	
NATIONAL INDUSTRIES FOR THE BLIND: NEED FOR A CONGRESSIONAL PROBE AND LEGISLATIVE REFORM	225
ARE WE BLIND, OR SOMETHING ELSE? WHAT'S IN A WORD?	227
by Jim Omvig	
A DEFINITION OF BLINDNESS	233
by Kenneth Jernigan	
DON'T UNDERRATE HER CUT	235
SEMINAR FOR PARENTS AND EDUCATORS OF BLIND CHILDREN	236
by Joanne Fernandes	
RECIPES	238
by Gene Parker	
MONITOR MINIATURES	239

A CONVERSATION WITH MILI

by Joyce Scanlan

(Reprinted from the Minnesota Bulletin, January/February, 1983.)

Most of my fellow Federationists have met Militant; we usually call her Mili. She is the third member of the Scanlan family who arrived at our house in July of 1979, just about the time the Minnesota Supreme Court rendered its favorable decision in our lawsuit against the Minneapolis Society for the Blind. Militant is a twelve-pound black and white toy terrier who plays a significant role in our lives.

Perhaps it was because Mili arrived when our Society election campaign was just going into full swing that her education as a Federationist was so speedy and complete. She learned very quickly to make appropriate responses at the very mention of Jesse Rosten, MSB, Bleecker, or NAC. With her vicious growls and short, snappy yips, she would express her displeasure. Likewise, with a high-pitched squeal and a bounding leap into the air, she would show delight over meeting Federationists or hearing comments that particularly please her. There's nothing wishy-washy about Mili; she's a real straight-shooter.

Although Mili would probably never say it, I can't help but think that the life of a dog in a Federationist household must be somewhat difficult. She has to be alone for long stretches of time. Because the people around her are so often involved in heated discussions and difficult decision making, things are not always fun and games for Mili. Yet she never complains about our fits of ill temper or lack of patience.

I really don't want to take advantage of Mili's good nature, but I suppose it's almost inevitable that I do. If I return home with a big problem to work out, she and I sit down together and discuss it. Mili knows everything I know about agencies for the blind, sheltered workshops, the bad and good folks running the programs, and the areas of discrimination facing blind Americans.

On January 9, 1983, the Minnesota Merchants Division held a day-long conference in St. Cloud. Mili remained at home, while Tom and I attended the conference. When we returned that night, poor little Mili really got an earful.

Members of the National Federation of the Blind have been ardent supporters of the Randolph-Sheppard program. Recognizing the employment problems facing blind persons generally, all of us have worked energetically to strengthen the business enterprises, vending facilities, or whatever title any such program may have in a given state. Resolutions granting rights to vendors have been discussed and adopted at national conventions. Federation funds, together with the energy of members, have been used to broaden opportunities under the Randolph-Sheppard Act through Federal legislation and action in many of the states. Considerable Federation resources have gone toward litigation to protect the rights of individual blind vendors. All of us have worked tire-

lessly to become knowledgeable about the relevant law and the benefits to be derived therefrom. All of this we have done because we know we must be involved in all activities which affect blind persons, whether or not we may be personally employed in a vending facility under the Randolph-Sheppard program.

Why then, is it that so few of these blind vendors are seen working with us in the National Federation of the Blind? They are direct beneficiaries of our efforts on behalf of the Randolph-Sheppard program. Their absence from the scene has often been a topic of conversation when Federationists gather to address vending issues. It was this very concern which I came home to lay on Mili on January 8.

I burst forth about how few vendors showed enough interest even to attend the conference; nine out of eighty-some were there. I exclaimed over the attitudes of a few vocal persons who did attend—how extremely negative they were and how uncaring they seemed to be about other people. I ranted about how much time we spent on improving the program and how self-centered and rude some of those vendors were. A couple of them were so blatant as to say that we could stop working on their program; they still wouldn't change their ways. I said I was appalled at their lack of concern over the fact that Minnesota's program has absolutely unfair rules. They declared that it didn't matter, since the rules weren't enforced in their cases. They seemed to be saying that they, alone, were competent operators, and the rules were designed to apply to all of the other vendors who were dishonest or incompetent. How can they say all this—and completely without shame?

Well, old Mili heard me out. Then she sat on the floor and faced me with her tail curled around her, her head cocked slightly, and her ears gently flapping. Now it was

my turn to listen.

"You are crazy," she began. "You sound almost like one of those agency people you've told me about. It sounds as though you're complaining because the vendors aren't grateful. You've said yourself that we don't attach strings to what we do for other people. You should be thankful that some vendors did come to the conference. Perhaps they didn't agree with everything they heard, but they did come to listen and probably learned quite a bit. We have no business even considering not working to improve the Randolph-Sheppard program. You threaten to quit working on vending issues as long as the majority of the vendors don't join the Federation and work with us. If we did that, we'd be guilty of behaving the same way they are—uncaring, self-centered, intolerant, etc. And belligerent, too. You've said that many of the vendors are grossly overqualified for the jobs they have. They're capable, but they've found themselves in a custodial environment, and, after so long, they probably believe they actually need that protection. It's natural they show some anger and resentment about all that. Sometimes those of us in the Federation forget about the people who haven't learned about options and choices. The ideas and information those few vendors learned for the first time at this conference will give them something to think about—new information which could drastically change their outlook for the future. We're all learning new things all the time. Remember how I figured out how to get out of the fence even when the gates were closed? Getting back in wasn't so pleasant, so I probably won't break out again; but I learned that I don't need to be confined within that fence if I really don't want to. The vendors will join the Federation ranks as they come to realize how that will help them. Of course, some of them may be lazy and satisfied with being on the

receiving end of benefits and advantages. Our concern has to be for those who are willing to share responsibilities with us. The majority of vendors will eventually fall into that category."

"Besides all that, don't complain about what happened at the conference. You had a choice; you could have stayed home with me. I was alone for almost fifteen hours, and I could have done some things to get even—if I were that kind of dog. Remember the time you returned home and found the contents of all the waste baskets strewn

from one end of the house to the other? I'm the one who should be complaining."

Mili, it's too bad you're not a rehabilitation counselor. What you're saying, of course, makes eminent sense. I must sound as bad to you as the vendors did to me. Be sure to keep yelling at me when I slip and start thinking all crazy. Just one more thing though, Mili. Please don't tell people about our little talk. If they knew, those rehab counselors for sure would say I'm not operating with both oars in the water.

LETTER FROM THE FIRST LADY OF ECUADOR

March 10, 1983

Dear Dr. Jernigan:

In my capacity as First Lady of Ecuador and as President of the National Institute of the Child and Family, I am writing to request the assistance of the National Federation of the Blind in improving the quality of life for blind Ecuadorians. I am greatly impressed with the care and concern of your organization in helping blind persons from developing countries such as ours and I am hopeful that with the help of the National Federation of the Blind, we will be able to greatly improve the situation of the blind here.

...

I understand that the National Federation of the Blind is the oldest and largest organization of the blind in the United States. I would like to express my admiration for your pioneering work as President of the National Federation of the Blind.

You are to be commended for personally developing a number of alternative techniques, programs and ideas which have improved life for many blind people. Your advocacy work on behalf of the rights of blind people in your country is truly remarkable. As of yet, we do not have a national organization of the blind in Ecuador, and we are hopeful that the National Federation of the Blind may serve as a model for us to follow.

On behalf of the National Institute of the Child and Family and the Ecuadorian people, I would like to thank you for your interest in the blind of our country and we pledge our best efforts in working with you to bring about a successful rehabilitation project for the blind. We look forward to working with you.

Sincerely,
Margarita Perez de Hurtado
Presidenta de Innfa

BLIND JUROR RECOGNIZED AS LEADER

by Sharon Gold

Performing jury duty is a right of citizenship which most Americans think little about unless they are called to serve. It is one of the many privileges of democracy which are often taken for granted unless, of course, you have been or know that you are likely to be denied this inherent right of and responsibility for community service.

Until recent years, if a blind citizen was summoned for jury duty and answered the call, the blind person was provided with one excuse after another for not being accepted as a juror, not the least of which was being labeled as incompetent, infirm, and decrepit because of lack of natural faculties. The few who were accepted to join fellow citizens from whom the lawyers would chose jurors, most often found themselves sitting day in and day out while, one after the other, their colleagues were selected and they, the blind, were ignored. But, we of the National Federation of the Blind are changing what it means to be blind and one of our many efforts has been focused on our civic right and responsibility to perform jury duty.

Lawrence "Muzzy" Marcelino is a long-time leader in the NFB and in his community. When he was President of our California affiliate in 1977, Muzzy organized and carried on a crusade to have the California Statutes amended to specify that no person shall be deemed incompetent to act as a juror solely because of the loss of sight.

Since the signing of this legislation into law, by Governor Brown, a few blind Cali-

fornians have served jury duty. Early this year, Muzzy was summoned. On the appointed day, he went to the San Francisco Court House where he joined other members of the community who had also been summoned for jury duty. In time, Muzzy was called and accepted as a member of a jury panel. At the conclusion of the four day trial, the jurors left the court room to begin deliberation on the verdict. As a part of this process, the jurors elect a foreman to serve as chair of the jury and to deliver the verdict to the court. Muzzy was elected by his eleven colleagues to be the foreman of the jury.

Following Muzzy's presentation to the court of the findings of the jury and at the conclusion of the case, Muzzy arose once more to address the court. "Your Honor and Ladies and Gentlemen: Until recently, the blind of California have encountered difficulty in serving as jurors. It was through the efforts of the National Federation of the Blind that a measure was passed by the California legislature which assured us the right to do so. The National Federation of the Blind is grateful that at last blind persons are exercising their right and privilege to serve as jurors. I am very proud to have had the opportunity to participate in what I consider to be a responsibility of citizenship. This has been a great day for me and the National Federation of the Blind."

Thus, we turn another page in our ever growing book, "Why the National Federation of the Blind?"

DIANE McGEORGE SENDS A LETTER TO UNITED AIRLINES

Denver, Colorado
March 13, 1983

Mr. Richard Ferris
Chief Executive Director
United Airlines, Inc.
Chicago, Illinois

Dear Mr. Ferris:

I want to bring to your attention a most unfortunate experience that occurred on United flight 469 while I was a passenger on that flight.

On March 13, I boarded flight 469 in Dallas returning to my home in Denver, Colorado. I was assigned a seat in the aircraft in the no smoking section as I had requested. As I proceeded down the jetway to board the plane, one of your staff was accompanying me and asked me if the agent who had assigned me seat 9C was aware that I was accompanied by my dog guide. I told him I assumed the agent did know since my dog and I approached the agent together.

I boarded the plane and was shown to my seat. So far, so good. After I was seated, one of the airlines personnel approached me and informed me that I must move to a seat in the bulkhead row stating this was a regulation. I told him that I believed that if he did further checking, he would discover this was incorrect. He persisted, saying I had to move to the bulkhead row of seats and I told him that my present seating arrangements were quite satisfactory. Once again I said I did not wish to move. He left saying he would bring back "the engineer." I was next

approached by a man who identified himself as John McDaniels who stated he was one of the pilots. He stated I had to move to the bulkhead row of seats or leave the airplane. I told him I would do neither. He then said that if I refused to move, they would be forced to return to the gate and I would have to deplane. I told him once again that my assigned seat was very satisfactory. He then said that I was obstinate, whereupon he left and the aircraft did return to the gate.

Following this, two crew members approached me and said that they were going to move the other two passengers seated in the row next to me. I asked them why they felt this was necessary. They said I refused to move and so the other passengers would be moved stating it was for safety reasons. When I asked what safety hazards my dog and I represented, I was told that if an emergency should occur it was their duty to get those people off the plane as soon as possible. I agreed with them completely and stated that I, too, would evacuate the plane quickly and that moving the other passengers made no sense at all. Seat 9C was an aisle seat and I suggested that if they were concerned about that location, I had volunteered to change places with the passenger seated in the seat by the window and that she had agreed to do this if such a change would satisfy the crew. However, the crew members would not consider such an alternative and relocated the passengers to another area of the aircraft.

I believe I have recounted this incident accurately. Now I wish to raise some

serious issues with you, Mr. Ferris, regarding this entire incident.

Your crew members were not informed concerning regulations regarding seating of blind passengers traveling with dog guides. They were hostile, tried to intimidate me, and treated me in a condescending manner which I find totally unacceptable. I am a competent business woman who flies thousands of miles each year, many of those thousands on United Airlines and I do not take kindly to having your crew members treat me as though I am a safety hazard and a menace to passengers who are seated next to me. The entire incident was totally uncalled for. Your crew members tried to intimidate me into moving from my assigned seat. When this highhanded tactic failed, they tried to intimidate me by saying I would have to leave the airplane if I did not move. When this failed, they said it was a safety measure, and a safety measure for whom: For sighted passengers. Why do airlines personnel assume that because I am blind and travel with a dog guide that I am necessarily any greater safety hazard than any other passenger? They are completely wrong about this and I find it a gross insult to me and to all blind people. When your crew members insisted on moving the passengers from the row in which I was seated, the next assumption must have been that I might possibly contaminate those people. Blindness is not contagious and once again this was embarrassing to me.

You speak of safety. Let me recount to you a very revealing incident which took place on a recent flight to Washington, D.C. Two of the flight attendants were visiting with me and some other passengers about a flight they had been on the previous day. They were laughing about a woman who had been on that flight. They said that the flight had been delayed and obviously the woman and her husband had spent the time

prior to the delayed departure in the cocktail lounge and that the woman was so drunk her husband had to get a wheelchair to bring her on board the airplane. They went on to say that the woman continued to drink and was so sick that they had to spend a great deal of their time looking after her. Yet they considered this incident to be humorous. I ask you, Mr. Ferris, if there was an emergency situation on the aircraft, which of us would create more of a safety hazard—a drunk passenger unable to board an airplane or a sober, competent blind traveler with a dog guide or white cane. Yet it is apparently acceptable for your airlines personnel to tell me I am a safety hazard and must sit in a designated area of the airplane. I tell you this is nonsense.

Blind people only want one thing from airlines. We want to be treated equally. We are thoroughly fed up with being harrassed, badgered, intimidated and with being treated as if we were profoundly retarded citizens who need caretakers. If we need assistance, we are perfectly capable of requesting it. Your personnel have demonstrated they will provide that assistance. However, your personnel have absolutely no right to embarrass, humiliate and intimidate us and this will no longer be tolerated.

If you really want to do something that will solve a lot of problems, work with us to develop a training film to be shown to your crew members and ground personnel demonstrating the most efficient way to assist blind people. Inform your ground personnel and crew members about regulations that do and do not exist. Your crew member told me I was obstinate because I chose to sit in my assigned seat. He would never dream of saying that to a sighted passenger.

Blind people have the same rights as sighted people who travel on airlines. It is

high time you realize it. It is also time you stop treating us like second class citizens. We, the blind, are a minority in society with all that implies. We are a minority who are insisting to be dealt with on equal terms. Intimidation and humiliating incidents created by your personnel simply will no longer be tolerated.

I strongly urge that you bring this matter to the attention of the appropriate people involved with flight 469 and that you take immediate steps to educate your personnel.

The National Federation of the Blind is the largest organization of blind people in the world. We wish to cooperate with you in every possible way in the education of your employees.

I trust I will receive a prompt reply to my letter.

Sincerely,
Diane McGeorge
Second Vice President
National Federation of the Blind

UNITED AIRLINES REPLIES TO DIANE McGEORGE

Chicago, Illinois
April 14, 1983

Dear Ms. McGeorge:

Mr. Ferris asked me to extend his personal and sincere apologies for the uncalled for incident aboard Flight 469 on March 13. Our crew members were wrong in attempting to reseat you. We're very sorry for the lack of courtesy and professionalism displayed in their attempts after the error was realized. Thank you for bringing this situation to our attention.

While it will not erase your experience, you have our assurance the entire matter has been thoroughly reviewed with all those involved to avoid a recurrence and improve the performance of our personnel.

We particularly regret this incident because we at United have always taken great pride in treating blind people equally. Your experience is not acceptable to us either. Corrective action has been taken.

Ms. McGeorge, we sincerely hope you won't think too harshly of us. United Airlines is committed to very high standards, and we would welcome the opportunity to demonstrate this to you. We're confident your future travels with us will be much more satisfactory.

Sincerely,
Randolph B. Ko
Assistant to the Chairman
United Airlines

KEN VOLONTE WRITES TO PACIFIC EXPRESS AIRLINES

(Note: Ken Volonte is one of the leaders of the Federation in California. He is also articulate and determined to have full membership in society.)

Scranton, California
March 31, 1983

Mr. Stan Cobb, President
Pacific Express Airlines
Chico, California

Dear Mr. Cobb:

On Sunday, March 27, I flew from Los Angeles to Stockton aboard flight 146. It was not a pleasant experience; and I wish to protest the treatment I received at the hands of your company.

I arrived at the airport well before the departure time. I already had my ticket, so I went right out to gate 398 to receive my seat assignment. The agent, Susan, assigned me to a bulkhead seat. This was not known to me until I got on the plane.

I am a blind person with a dog guide. I prefer to sit in a non-bulkhead seat. This is because the dog lies vertically under my seat with his head under the seat in front of me. My feet are on either side of the dog's body. In that way, both of us are comfortable; and the seat next to me may be occupied by another passenger.

When we are in a bulkhead seat, the dog must lie horizontally in front of me. My legs are then cramped under my seat. Further, with the dog stretched out across two seats, you lose one seat that could be occupied by another paying customer.

I explained all of this to one of the flight attendants whose name was Rachael. She told me that it was company policy for

blind people with dogs to be assigned to bulkhead seats. She went further. She said that the FAA regulations demanded this as well as her flight attendant's manual. The FAA has no such regulation. If Pacific Express does have one, please be aware that it is not necessary or practical.

Suppose that more than two blind people with dogs wanted to fly on the same plane. Would person three have to wait for the next flight owing to the unavailability of bulkhead seats? If that is the case, then your airline would be guilty of violating Section 54.1 of the California Civil Code which guarantees blind people with dog guides the right to equal access to any public carrier.

The unpleasantness didn't stop with my having to sit in a bulkhead seat. I was told that in the event of an emergency that I would be the last to deplane. Blind people can walk just as fast as other people provided we are not otherwise handicapped. As an illustration, I was the first one off the plane when we landed in Stockton, although Rachael would have had it otherwise.

Mr. Cobb, I don't expect a lot from people. I only want to be treated with the same respect as other people. I am sure that Rachael and Susan acted as they did on the basis of what they thought I needed. Be that as it may, their treatment of me was at best arrogant and patronizing. At worst, it was downright rude.

What is Pacific Express's policy regarding

the treatment of blind people with dog guides? If you don't have one, then let your flight attendants know you don't have one.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,
Ken Volonte, President

Greater Stockton Area Chapter
National Federation of the Blind
Western Division

P.S. For further information on the needs of blind people, feel free to contact our state office at 5974 South Land Park Drive, Sacramento, California 95831.

If you or a friend would like to remember the National Federation of the Blind in your will, you can do so by employing the following language:

"I give, devise, and bequeath unto National Federation of the Blind, a District of Columbia nonprofit corporation, the sum of \$_____ (or "_____percent of my net estate" or "the following stocks and bonds: _____") to be used for its worthy purposes on behalf of blind persons."

RIPLEY'S MAKES A POSITIVE REPLY

In last month's issue of the *Braille Monitor* we carried an article written by Dan Hicks of Florida entitled "Ripley's Rips Off the Blind." In that article Dan Hicks pointed out that the Ripley's ABC television show for January 23, 1983, falsely portrayed blindness and blind people. The Ripley's show dealt with an experimental infrared navigation device (or mobility aid) for the blind and sensationalized and over-dramatized it. There were such statements as: "a few precious steps out of the darkness," and Dan Hicks wrote a restrained but very firm protest.

In his letter he said:

Dear Sirs:

Let me begin by stating that I am a member of the National Federation of

the Blind and a member of the Board of Directors of the National Federation of the Blind of Florida.

I was shocked and annoyed by your treatment of blindness and blind people in the episode of Ripley's Believe It Or Not which aired January 23rd of this year...

The Report begins with the sentence: "But for the blind, any walk is hazardous." There are no grounds for such a glib statement. It is based solely on thoughtless prejudice...

Your report doesn't stop there but charges ahead with other statements such as: "Bill takes his first tentative steps toward freedom," and "Like a bat using sonar, Bill can now find his way."

Public education is a never ending process. Sometimes it brings a positive response and sometimes a reaction of hostility, but it is the total effect that counts—the unrelenting, day to day effort to improve the public attitude. This is why the work of the National Federation of the Blind is so vital and why it is paying off.

Dan Hicks received a reply to his letter. It was dated March 1, 1983; and it came from Mel Stuart, the Supervising Producer of Ripley's Believe It Or Not:

Dear Mr. Hicks:
As supervising producer of *Ripley's*

Believe It Or Not, I have no defense against your criticisms of our program of January 23rd. I am very sensitive to the problems of the blind and, in re-examining the script, I am surprised that I allowed certain phrases to remain in the script. This is the third episode we have produced dealing with people afflicted by blindness. The first dealt with a blind marathon runner and the second dealt with a blind carpenter in Santa Barbara. I feel confident that you would have approved of our treatment of those two subjects. Please be assured that in the future we will be most careful in our treatment of the subject.

THE TOWEL TEST

by Kenneth Jernigan

Eugene Davis is a lawyer who lives and works in Des Moines. I have known and respected him for a great many years. It was only recently, however, that I learned that his brother is a minister and that his mother, who died within the past few months, was a financial contributor to the Federation.

Eugene (or, as those of us who are his friends call him, "Gene") shared with me some comments made by his brother. I think you will find them as moving and thought provoking as I did. Perhaps they help explain, in a way that nothing else could, the power and force of our movement—its appeal, its momentum, its call to commitment. Perhaps they will also cause all of us to do soul searching to determine whether our priorities are in order and our degree of involvement what it should be.

There are those (especially, some of the employees and administrators of the governmental and private agencies working with the blind) who try to tell us that our organization is not a "movement;" but, of course, that is a question which only we ourselves can settle. The members of an assemblage are the sole determiners of whether that assemblage is a "movement." It is a "movement" if its members regard it as such and act accordingly. Otherwise, it is merely an organization, a social gathering, a political action committee, or whatever else its constituents believe it to be and make it.

Be all of this as it may, the following comments from the Reverend Julius Davis are pertinent to the point and central to the issue:

Pastor's Paragraphs—
THE TOWEL TEST

"Jesus . . . rose from supper . . . girded himself with a towel. Then he poured water into a basin, and began to wash the disciples' feet. . ." (John 13:4)

I doubt if Jesus could have demonstrated a greater example of humility and loving service. When the disciples would remember this last supper with Jesus, the servant role would stay with them. How could they forget Jesus girding himself with a towel? Peter was chagrined and embarrassed that Jesus insisted on washing his feet. Later he would understand. If we follow Jesus we

too must practice the equivalent of washing feet in serving one another in love.

Keep a towel handy, for God has feet for you to wash!

I deeply appreciate all the acts of thoughtfulness and kindness from so many of you at the time of my mother's death.

My mother was becoming blind the last few weeks of her long life (nearly 88), and I learned that she had made several sizable gifts to the National Federation of the Blind, out of her Social Security checks. What this says to me is that age or physical infirmity does not have to keep us from passing the towel test. Alleluia!

—Julius Davis

NATIONAL INDUSTRIES FOR THE BLIND:

NEED FOR A CONGRESSIONAL PROBE AND LEGISLATIVE REFORM

National Industries for the Blind (NIB) is an agency designated by the government to allocate federal contracts among 103 sheltered workshops. The shops, located in most sizable urban areas, qualify to receive government orders channeled through NIB if they have enough blind people performing direct labor jobs.

NIB's responsibilities are prescribed by federal regulations published and administered by the Committee for Purchase from the Blind and Other Severely Handicapped. The statutory authority for the Committee is the Wagner-O'Day Act, as amended (41 U.S.C. 46-48c). The Committee is a small federal agency with a staff of twelve and an appropriation of \$653,000 during Fiscal Year 1983. As its name suggests, the Committee is expected to oversee federal purchases from workshops employing the

blind affiliated with NIB and workshops employing the other severely handicapped affiliated with a group known as National Industries for the Severely Handicapped (NISH). However, NIB is by far the largest of these two agencies.

In contrast to the small staff and modest budget of the Committee, NIB has a staff of almost seventy and a funding arrangement which places virtually no restriction on either the amount or the use of its funds. The source of the problem is the Committee's rules which permit NIB to receive a commission on each government order from a sheltered workshop. The statute makes no provision for such an arrangement. NIB's commission is normally 4% of the amount paid by the government for procurements from the workshops. A 10% commission is charged on some pur-

chases of commodities under a program known as "military resale." The General Accounting Office (GAO) has found that these commission charges are a federal expense since the Committee figures NIB's share into the prices it sets for the items bought from the workshops. The result of this arrangement is a funding mechanism which circumvents the budget and appropriations process, according to GAO.

NIB refuses to allow any form of public scrutiny or disclosure of its financial dealings. Even so, its estimated federal revenue take last year exceeded \$5.5 million. In 1980, NIB declined to provide financial reports to the House Subcommittee on Labor Standards, arguing that the Subcommittee lacked jurisdiction over such matters. In 1981, when the GAO suggested that NIB's activities should be subject to an annual budget review, NIB objected in its official written response.

The evidence is clear that NIB has carved out a uniquely lofty position, wherein its very existence is established by a federal regulation and its funding is guaranteed by that same regulation. It wields unchecked powers over the distribution of federal contracts, currently amounting to nearly \$150 million, and it tells anyone who inquires that its financial dealings are not to be scrutinized by the Committee or by Congress. Moreover, all of this is done in the name of helping the blind, while none of the NIB principals are, themselves, blind. The most recent report is that NIB has only one blind employee—an individual handling clerical duties and a telephone switchboard.

GAO found evidence that NIB carries on numerous activities not provided for by statutory or regulatory authority. Some of this includes hiring expensive Washington lawyers to fight blind people who want to have collective bargaining in the NIB affiliated shops. Another expense is to pay workshops who agree to insulate them-

selves from blind critics through a self-serving form of "accreditation." This involves monetary payments by NIB to a group called NAC, the National Accreditation Council for Agencies Serving the Blind and Visually Handicapped.

NIB officials make no secret of their hostility toward the National Federation of the Blind. We have evidence that "sales conferences" (paid for with NIB's federal revenues) have actually become strategy sessions to plan attacks upon leaders of the organized blind movement. Recent attacks have included the apparent covert funding of litigation against us. The costs of this campaign may well have exceeded one-half million dollars, but the attempt to ruin and smear was entirely unsuccessful. A serious, targeted probe of NIB's financial transactions would, of course, be necessary to disclose the precise role which it played and the magnitude of its participation. Such an investigation is clearly in order in view of NIB's public posture toward organized blind consumers and the unique character of its funding arrangement.

Because of its legislative and oversight jurisdiction, the Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources would (if the Chairman determines to do so) be in a position to investigate NIB's activities and provide public disclosure of its financial dealings. The Chairman (Senator Hatch) is aware of this situation and has said that the Committee will conduct hearings. However, no schedule has been set at this point (late April, 1983); nor do we have any sense that the Committee's investigative resources and talent are being brought to bear on the NIB affair. Naturally, there are competing priorities.

In the House of Representatives jurisdiction over these matters is exercised by the Committee on Government Operations. More specifically, jurisdiction is exercised by the Subcommittee on Manpower and

Housing, chaired by Representative Barney Frank of Massachusetts. Hearings before Representative Frank's subcommittee have been scheduled for mid-May. Hopefully, by the time this article is printed, those hearings will have been held and will be on their way to bearing fruit.

The objective in the short range should be to compel public financial disclosure by NIB, something which it has stubbornly resisted in the past. Once the records are produced (say for a period of the past five years), investigators should examine all expenditures to determine whether they fall within the scope of NIB's regulatory mandate. The sources of NIB's revenue should be examined and all expenditures should be traced to determine their

ultimate impact. Any expense which is not clearly related to the allocation of government orders to sheltered workshops should be probed to determine its purpose and result, as well as to identify the statutory authority under which such payments were made. The recipients of any grants, contracts, or gratuities should be identified. In short, a thorough, professional investigation under the authority of the Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources is in order. This should be done without further delay, after which the Committee should turn its attention to the development of legislation to assure public accountability and responsible management of this special federal procurement program.

ARE WE BLIND, OR SOMETHING ELSE?

WHAT'S IN A WORD?

by Jim Omvig

In the March, 1983 *Monitor* we reprinted a speech which I delivered at our Michigan convention on what a commission for the blind should be. There have been quite a number of comments about it and reactions to it. Among others, I received a letter from Larry Israel, President, Visualtek regarding our use of the word "blind." Since the issue raised is one which frequently comes up, it seemed to me that a very thorough response was in order. Following is a complete reprint of Mr. Israel's letter together with my reply:

Dear Mr. Omvig,

I enjoyed the reprint of your address which appeared in *The Braille Monitor* under the title *What We Can Expect From a Commission for the Blind, Viewpoint From the Consumers*.

Although much of what you said was not unfamiliar to me, since I have been involved with blindness, NFB, etc., for nearly twelve years, there are a few comments you made about which I'd like to open some sort of discussion with you or other knowledgeable people associated with NFB.

As you may know, Visualtek is concerned solely with the provision of electronic visual aids (CCTV reading machines, if you prefer that terminology) for people

Santa Monica, California
March 21, 1983

who have severe visual limitations, but are not totally blind. We have no bias against the totally blind—it just happens that we don't serve that community. Because of this environment, issues and terminology related to blindness other than total blindness are of particular interest to us.

The major item in your talk which triggers a response is under the bold-face heading: "Blindness must be discussed and the word 'blind' must be used and stressed." The last sentence in that paragraph then says: "Therefore, such phrases as 'visually impaired, visually limited, or sightless' should not be used."

Setting aside the fact that 'sightless' may not be in the same category as the first two phrases, would I be correct in assuming that this sentence should be qualified by adding: ". . . to describe persons totally without sight," or did you intend it to stand unqualified? If the latter, how do you fairly and accurately describe persons who have visual impairments or limitations, but are not totally blind? How is Visualtek to describe, in literature and elsewhere, the type of persons it is able to serve, if we should not use such terminology?

We have always used the terms 'visually impaired' and 'visually limited' to mean someone who had an impairment or limitation, but was not totally without light perception (or so close to it such that any distinction was meaningless). We know how to use the word 'blind,' but we tend to say 'totally blind' merely to ensure clear communication. Over the years, we have found that the word 'blind' is not well-defined; many people continue to think that 'blind' means 'totally without sight.'

I could reasonably put the issue in this way: wouldn't you agree that there are many situations where it is desirable to clearly communicate whether a person was totally without light perception, or had useable but severely limited visual capabili-

ties? Clearly, we could develop lengthier descriptions which would communicate such distinctions clearly, but the history of human communication has been to develop shorthand modes of communication in many areas. I would submit that is what most people mean by 'visually impaired' or 'visually limited.' I am not condoning . . . and in fact would criticize . . . use of such terms as euphemisms for blind. I share your beliefs in dealing openly and straightforwardly with blindness, and using the word 'blind' when it is appropriate.

If I am wrong, and there is in fact widespread and damaging use of 'visually impaired' and 'visually limited' to conceal the truth of blindness, then what would you suggest as convenient and acceptable ways to draw the distinction, when it is desirable or necessary to do so?

What does "blind" mean? I am familiar with the legal definition, but it seems useful only in a legal domain, or as an arbitrary classifier. Sam Genensky, whose work you are probably familiar with, has attempted to establish a series of terms to describe different levels of functional capability, which span the spectrum from total blindness to those whose visual impairment does not even qualify them as legally blind. Although there seems to be merit in his attempts to improve communications on this topic, I do not believe his definitions are widely understood, nor have they been widely accepted, to the best of my knowledge.

Has NFB ever addressed this question, whether formally or informally? Can you provide me with a definition of blindness which helps to unmuddy the waters, yet is not arbitrary or overly technical?

To get a bit more specific (by way of example), how would you describe and propose dealing with a person whose visual capabilities permitted adequate mobility without assistance, and no significant prob-

lems regarding orientation, yet couldn't read worth a damn using even the best correction available? Describe such a person as 'blind' is misleading at best, and certainly is no aid to clear communications (although there may be some situations where it is adequate or tolerable to use that description). It would not seem necessary or desirable, in most cases, for such a person to be at the kind of center you describe. I might note that there appear to be substantial numbers of people, who can be described in this manner, who are active and energetic members of NFB. One would hardly know it, from reading your literature!

Please be assured that this letter comes to you in a spirit of honest and open inquiry. I have learned much, over the past 12 years, from reading *The Braille Monitor*. If this letter helps me to learn more, it will be well worth the effort.

Sincerely,
Larry Israel,
President,
Visualtek

Baltimore, Maryland
April 8, 1983

Dear Mr. Israel:

This will thank you for and reply to your letter of March 21, 1983, concerning the use of the word "blind" as discussed in our March reprint of my speech, "What We Can Expect From a Commission for the Blind, Viewpoint From the Consumers." I very much appreciate the fact that you are a regular *Monitor* reader, that the speech interested you and that you were willing to take the time to write. (Incidentally, I have also reviewed letters which you have writ-

ten on this subject to Mrs. Pat Munson of the NFB, Western Division.)

Let me begin with a very general observation which may appear to be unrelated to the questions you raise but which, I assure you, is key as we of the Federation work to improve the quality of life for all blind persons. If more professionals would make a sincere effort as you have to learn and understand the philosophies and goals of the National Federation of the Blind rather than simply to go on the attack concerning what they do not understand, there would be much more harmony and goodwill, and the world would be a better place for all blind persons. I commend you for concluding your letter by saying "If this letter helps me to learn more, it will be well worth the effort," and I hope you mean what you say.

Now, let us turn to your letter. First, you are right on target in that the legal definitions of blindness don't help much—at best, they give only loose guidance. While most persons who are "legally blind" cannot function well with regular sized inkprint, some really do function efficiently and for sustained periods of time. On the other hand, there are some persons who are not "legally blind" who can scarcely function at all using inkprint. And so it goes with all facets of human endeavor. Then, there are some persons, totally blind, legally blind or not legally blind but who do not function at all well with sighted techniques. However, they insist upon using them no matter how ineffective they may be and steadfastly refuse to use "blind" techniques even though such techniques would be far superior to sighted techniques.

Since it would be difficult to answer your letter question by question, I shall first provide you with a general response and statement. Then, if questions remain, I shall answer them individually.

The basic question you raise is this:

When either I as an individual or the National Federation of the Blind use the word "blind," are we talking only about those who are totally blind or do we also intend to include and describe those persons who have some remaining vision which is quite useable at least in some situations?

Those of us who have a profound interest in improving the quality of life for all blind persons have given serious and extensive thought as to just how this goal can best be achieved. It did not take too long to conclude that nothing else we can do really matters very much if we are not willing first to face the "real" issue and to overcome it: namely, how do we perceive ourselves, and how are we perceived by others around us?

I believe that this simple analogy will help you to understand: Black persons in our country are a minority with every negative connotation which the word "minority" implies. They are stereotyped; they have faced and continue to face terrible discrimination; and their problem is clearly a social one, an attitudinal one, not a physical one. Obviously, the color of one's skin has nothing whatever to do with basic normality and competency, and it should have nothing to do with a person's right to enjoy equal opportunity. But, because of prejudice and misconception, black persons have been thought of (and have thought of themselves) as being all alike, inferior, lacking in ability, abnormal, unequal and literally as a people not entitled to the rights and privileges which go hand in hand with first-class citizenship.

Through the years black persons have taken two separate and very diverse approaches in an effort to solve their problems. I am sure I don't need to remind you that there were some (sadly, far too many) who thought that they could solve their problems by pretending that they were white (normal). They rubbed a variety of

potions on their skin to lighten its color and straightened their hair if it happened to be curly. But, this didn't change a thing—no one was fooled, particularly the black person who was so ashamed of being black that he or she actually played out the deception. What a life! How would it feel to "pass off" for white fearing all the while that someone would find out?

Thank God for enlightened black leaders: leaders who said, "It's o.k. to be black; it's respectable to be black; it's normal to be black; and, rather than trying to solve our problem by pretending we are white, if we have any sense, we will get together and change social attitudes so that it is respectable to be black; and the first step is for 'us' to teach ourselves new attitudes." With this kind of positive, social thinking, change began!

But, what of those who are only "partially black," or is it "partially white"—those who are the offspring of mixed marriages? Are they black or are they white or are they something else altogether? Rightly or wrongly, people in our country, both black and white, regard these individuals as black. Because of prejudice and discrimination, they face the same problems which are faced by the "totally black," and they must take the same steps if they intend to solve their problems. Can you imagine such an individual, faced either with problems of discrimination or a lack of self esteem, saying, "Why, I'm not black, I'm mulatto."

Now, let us return to those of us who are blind, whether we are totally blind or have some useable vision. Our problem is precisely the same as that of black persons: We are a minority; we are stereotyped; we have faced and continue to face terrible discrimination; and "our" problem is clearly a social one, an attitudinal one, not a physical one. Obviously, the amount of vision in one's eyes has nothing whatever to do with

basic normality and competency, and it should have nothing to do with a person's right to enjoy equal opportunity. But, because of prejudice and misconception, blind persons have been thought of (and have thought of themselves) as being all alike, inferior, lacking in ability, abnormal, unequal and literally as a people not entitled to the rights and privileges which go hand in hand with first-class citizenship.

As with blacks, it follows from this type of negative, social thinking and from long-standing social conditioning that blind persons have gone through a period of feeling shame and embarrassment. Who wants to be an inferior? Why not just pretend you are sighted—refuse to use Braille, refuse to use a long cane or dog guide, refuse to put your hands on something to "see" it, or refuse to let anyone know that you are blind?

Ah, what a solution! All we really do is provide more income for the medical profession for treating ulcers or psychological problems.

What is the difference if an employer or school refuses to hire you or let you in, "because you are blind"; "because you are sightless"; "because you are visually impaired" or "just because you are a little hard of seeing?" There is no difference! The problems, the results and the solutions are the same no matter what you call yourself or what you are called by others—**A ROSE IS A ROSE, IS A ROSE, IS A ROSE.**

We of the Federation have taken a lesson from black persons, and we do not intend to make the same mistake which was made by some of them. We intend to work together toward the day when blind people have true equality, when it is respectable to be blind and when we can say, as the author said, "I'm o.k., you're o.k." The very first step in this process is for those of us who are blind to "accept" rather than

deny our blindness, to come to have a real belief in ourselves and then to work together to change broader social thinking so that fear and shame may be replaced with confidence, hope and opportunity.

The Federation's course is clear and well charted. The only question which remains is whether blind persons not in the Federation, agencies and service providers, and manufacturers of technology can grasp the importance of changing the image of what it means to be blind, and will join with us to do something about it.

In your letter you asked whether anyone has ever developed a workable definition of blindness. Yes! We have! Quite a number of years ago our national President, Dr. Kenneth Jernigan, wrote a paper entitled "A Definition of Blindness" (copy attached). We of the Federation have incorporated this document into our overall philosophy, and I hope that you will study it thoroughly and do likewise.

Dr. Jernigan states in part as follows:

One is blind to the extent that he must devise alternative techniques to do efficiently those things which he would do with sight if he had normal vision. An individual may properly be said to be "blind" or a "blind person" when he has to devise so many alternative techniques—that is, if he is to function efficiently—that his pattern of daily living is substantially altered....

I repeat that, in my opinion, blindness can best be defined not physically or medically but functionally or sociologically. The alternative techniques which must be learned are the same for those born blind as for those who become blind as adults. They are quite similar (or should be) for those who are totally blind or nearly so and those who are "partially sighted" and yet are blind in

the terms of the usually accepted legal definition. In other words, I believe that the complex distinctions which are often made between those who have partial sight and those who are totally blind, between those who have been blind from childhood and those who have become blind as adults are largely meaningless. In fact, they are often harmful since they place the wrong emphasis on blindness and its problems. Perhaps the greatest danger in the field of work for the blind today is the tendency to be hypnotized by jargon.

Finally, on philosophy, add the following: Blind people are normal people who, with proper training and opportunity and through the use of alternative techniques including effective low vision aids, can participate fully and successfully in the total range of human endeavor. However, a very real danger exists when blind persons deny their blindness and use sighted techniques which, for them, are inferior to blind techniques. Such an individual will most likely fail, but it is not because of his or her blindness—it is because of a denial of blindness and the resulting inability to function.

So where does all of this leave you, Visualtek, rehabilitation and other professionals in the field? Since it can hardly be said that you are selling your equipment to "sighted persons," why not sell it to blind persons who have visual capabilities in certain situations? I assume that you would not believe that the Federation would approach an employer about hiring a blind person with some vision and decline to tell that employer that the individual has some vision which may be useful for some things. Contrary to what some of our antagonists preach, we are not "making blind people"

out of sighted people.

Turning to rehabilitation, in your letter you say, "It would not seem necessary or desirable, in most cases, for such a person [having some vision] to be at the kind of center you describe." If you will reread my speech, you will find quite a long discussion on the use of sleepshades in an orientation center for those blind students who have some vision so that they can properly learn alternative techniques and also become competent to make a decision as to whether, for efficiency, they should use either blind or sighted techniques.

The word "blind" should also be used in education, and blind children should be taught to read and write Braille, cane travel, etcetera. Again, those of us who have considerable experience in this field are shocked and dismayed when we see Braille training being denied blind children who can read either through large print or visual aids at no more than fifteen or twenty words a minute. Apparently it has not occurred to the teachers and professionals that such deprivation will hurt the blind child for the rest of his or her life.

Again, I appreciate the fact that you have written to me. Because of the importance of this issue, I have taken more than a little time to respond. I hope that you will make a thorough study of this information and that it is helpful to you.

Very truly yours,
James H. Omvig

P.S. To make sure that this letter is not confusing to you, let me make it very clear that we are not saying and have never said that a device such as the Visualtek cannot be a valuable tool for a blind person. It can be if we know when to use it and when not to.

A DEFINITION OF BLINDNESS

by Kenneth Jernigan

Before we can talk intelligently about the problems of blindness or the potentialities of blind people, we must have a workable definition of blindness. Most of us are likely familiar with the generally accepted legal definition: visual acuity of not greater than 20/200 in the better eye with correction or a field not subtending an angle greater than 20 degrees. But this is not really a satisfactory definition. It is, rather, a way of recognizing in medical and measurable terms something which must be defined not medically or physically but functionally.

Putting to one side for a moment the medical terminology, what is blindness? Once I asked a group of high school students this question, and one of them replied—apparently believing that he was making a rather obvious statement—that a person is blind if he “can’t see.” When the laughter subsided, I asked the student if he really meant what he said. He replied that he did. I then asked him whether he would consider a person blind who could see light but who could not see objects—a person who would bump into things unless he used a cane, a dog, or some other travel aid and who would, if he depended solely on the use of his eyesight, walk directly into a telephone pole or fire plug. After some little hesitation the student said that he would consider such a person to be blind. I agreed with him and then went on to point out the obvious—that he literally did not mean that the definition of blindness was to be unable to see.

I next told this student of a man I had

known who had “normal” (20/20) visual acuity in both eyes but who had such an extreme case of sensitivity to light that he literally could not keep his eyes open at all. The slightest amount of light caused such excruciating pain that the only way he could open his eyes was by prying them open with his fingers. Nevertheless, this person, despite the excruciating pain he felt while doing it, could read the eye chart without difficulty. The readings showed that he had “normal sight.” This individual applied to the local Welfare Department for Public Assistance to the Blind and was duly examined by their ophthalmologist. The question I put to the student was this: “If you had been the ophthalmologist, would you have granted the aid or not?”

His answer was, “Yes.”

“Remember,” I told him, “under the law you are forbidden to give aid to any person who is not actually blind. Would you still have granted the assistance?” The student said that he would. Again, I agreed with him, but I pointed out that, far from his first facetious statement, what he was saying was this: It is possible for one to have “perfect sight” and still in the physical, literal sense of the word be blind.

I then put a final question to the student. I asked him whether if a sighted person were put into a vault which was absolutely dark so that he could see nothing whatever, it would be accurate to refer to that sighted person as a blind man. After some hesitation and equivocation the student said, “No.” For a third time I agreed with him. Then I asked him to examine

what we had established:

1. To be blind does not mean that one cannot see. (Here again I must interrupt to say that I am not speaking in spiritual or figurative terms but in the most literal sense of the word.)
2. It is possible for an individual to have "perfect sight" and yet be physically and literally blind.
3. It is possible for an individual not to be able to see at all and still be a sighted person.

What, then, in light of these seeming contradictions is the definition of blindness? In my way of thinking it is this: One is blind to the extent that he must devise alternative techniques to do efficiently those things which he would do with sight if he had normal vision. An individual may properly be said to be "blind" or a "blind person" when he has to devise so many alternative techniques—that is, if he is to function efficiently—that his pattern of daily living is substantially altered. It will be observed that I say *alternative* not *substitute* techniques, for the word *substitute* connotes inferiority, and the alternative techniques employed by the blind person need not be inferior to visual techniques. In fact, some of them are superior. The usually accepted legal definition of blindness already given (that is, visual acuity of less than 20/200 with correction or a field of less than 20 degrees) is simply one medical way of measuring and recognizing that anyone with better vision than the amount mentioned in the definition will (although he may have to devise some alternative techniques) likely not have to devise so many such techniques as to alter substantially his patterns of daily living. On the other hand, anyone with less vision than that mentioned in the legal definition will usually (I emphasize the word *usually*,

for such is not always the case) need to devise so many such alternative techniques as to alter quite substantially his patterns of daily living.

It may be of some interest to apply this standard to the three cases already discussed:

First, what of the person who has light perception but sees little or nothing else? In at least one situation he can function as a sighted person. If, before going to bed, he wishes to know whether the lights are out in his home, he can simply walk through the house and "see." If he did not have light perception, he would have to use some alternative technique—touch the bulb, tell by the position of the switch, have some sighted person give him the information, or devise some other method. However, this person is still quite properly referred to as a blind person. This one visual technique which he uses is such a small part of his overall pattern of daily living as to be negligible in the total picture. The patterns of his daily living are substantially altered. In the main he employs alternative techniques to do those things which he would do with sight if he had normal vision—that is, he does if he functions efficiently.

Next, let us consider the person who has normal visual acuity but cannot hold his eyes open because of his sensitivity to light. He must devise alternative techniques to do anything which he would do with sight if he had normal vision. He is quite properly considered to be a "blind person."

Finally, what of the sighted person who is put into a vault which has no light? Even though he can see nothing at all, he is still quite properly considered to be a "sighted person." He uses the same techniques that any other sighted person would use in a similar situation. There are no visual techniques which can be used in such circumstances. In fact, if a blind person found himself in such a situation, he might very

well have a variety of techniques to use.

I repeat that, in my opinion, blindness can best be defined not physically or medically but functionally or sociologically. The alternative techniques which must be learned are the same for those born blind as for those who become blind as adults. They are quite similar (or should be) for those who are totally blind or nearly so and those who are "partially sighted" and yet are blind in the terms of the usually accepted legal definition. In other words, I believe

that the complex distinctions which are often made between those who have partial sight and those who are totally blind, between those who have been blind from childhood and those who have become blind as adults are largely meaningless. In fact, they are often harmful since they place the wrong emphasis on blindness and its problems. Perhaps the greatest danger in the field of work for the blind today is the tendency to be hypnotized by jargon.

DON'T UNDERRATE HER CUT

The 1973 Annual Report of the Iowa Commission for the Blind was entitled *Independence*. Among other things, it contained a picture showing a blind woman operating a large band saw. She was wearing a blindfold—or, to use the proper terminology, "sleepshades." The narrative accompanying the picture said:

Blindness won't keep her from operating a band saw—nor will being a woman. Don't underrate her cut. Blindfolds (called sleepshades) are used in class by those students with some remaining vision to overcome false dependency on inadequate sight and to learn faster the alternative techniques of blindness. If the individual continues to try to use visual techniques (even though they are inadequate for her), she will probably not learn blind techniques at all. Also, if she has 10% or less remaining vision (the generally accepted definition of blindness) and learns (without blindfold) to operate a power saw or some other tool, she will likely think the reason she can do it is because she still has some sight. She won-

ders what will happen if she loses any or all of the remainder.

If, on the other hand, she blindfolds herself and learns that she can function with safety and efficiency in the manner of a totally blind person, it tends to remove the fear. When the techniques have been learned to reflex perfection, she can remove the sleepshades and use the combination of visual and blind techniques best suited to her own personal need. Her willingness to undergo such training will depend almost entirely on whether she perceives it as "relevant" to her situation—which, in turn, will largely be determined by whether her instructors have the experience and maturity to see the "relevance." If the atmosphere is such that the student must be "required" to wear the sleepshades, use a cane, or employ any other technique, the value is probably already lost. At the heart of the matter are the subtle and often unrecognized attitudes about what blindness really is and what it really means—whether the blind person can truly compete on terms of equality, wheth-

er she can actually perform as well as others, and whether she can really be a full-fledged, first-class citizen with all the rights and privileges and also with all of the responsibilities. Here, in this crucial area,

many professionals in the field fall short (often without even knowing it) and do much damage. They lack understanding and skill. Even more, they lack belief that the blind can achieve INDEPENDENCE.

SEMINAR FOR PARENTS AND EDUCATORS OF BLIND CHILDREN

by Joanne Fernandes, Seminar Chairperson

(Note: On April 10, 1983, Joanne Fernandes was elected President of the National Federation of the Blind of Louisiana.)

"We believe in your child." This was the message heard over and over again at the very successful seminar for parents and educators of blind children held on Saturday, March 5, 1983, in Monroe, Louisiana, sponsored by the National Federation of the Blind of Louisiana. The seminar was attended by over 30 families of blind children from all areas of the state, by members of the staff of Blind Services from three regional offices, by many teachers including the entire staff from the Shreveport School System that works with blind children, and, of course, by many of our own Federationists.

We heard some very fine presentations from our two out-of-state guests, Mrs. Barbara Cheadle and Mrs. Susan Ford. Mrs. Cheadle is the editor of "Future Reflections," the national newsletter for parents and educators of blind children published by the National Federation of the Blind, and is the mother of a blind child. Mrs. Ford is the chairperson of the Parental Concerns Committee of the NFB, the mother of a blind child, and holds a Masters degree in teaching blind children.

She presently is employed by the St. Louis school system and ABLE, an adult rehabilitation center for the blind.

After a few opening remarks, Mrs. Cheadle began the morning with a presentation about the preschool child. This was followed by an in-depth presentation by Mrs. Ford, Mrs. Cheadle, and Donald Banning concerning the blind child in school. Donald Banning is a resource teacher for blind children in Jefferson Parish, and is our state NFB legislative chairperson. Mr. Banning presented the group with information regarding the laws that protect blind children and what are the rights of the parents. Mrs. Cheadle told about ways of negotiating with the school system. Mrs. Ford spoke on what constitutes a good education with particular emphasis on the questions of Braille and cane travel. During the lunch break informal discussions and sharing continued. An excellent exhibit also provided those present with many, many excellent pieces of information to take home with them.

In the afternoon the child was taken through the teenage years, dating, marriage,

and employment. Two special presentations by Wade Cobb and Teretha Taylor, blind NFB members, were given concerning vocational opportunities.

Mrs. Cheadle concluded the day by telling the participants about the newsletter and the new parents' organization that will be started at the national convention of the NFB in July in Kansas City. All parents were invited to join this group.

Besides the direct and obvious benefits from this seminar, there were also many additional services provided. Over 200 response cards were received back from the mailing that was done to inform parents and teachers about the seminar. These persons indicated an interest in receiving the NFB newsletter for parents and teachers of blind children. Their responses also indicated an interest and a need for future seminars in different locations in the state. Those who responded will also be sent information about local chapters of the NFB that are in their areas. A special thank you needs to go out to Mr. Jerry Swearingen, director of Blind Services, and Dr. Richard Day, Superintendent of the Louisiana School for the Visually Impaired, for addressing the mailings to parents that were sent notifying them about the seminar.

The presence of our own interested state NFB members was a great benefit also. It gave the parents the opportunity to see and meet independent blind adults, and it gave our members the opportunity to learn more about blind children so that they can carry this knowledge back to their chapters. Cassette recordings of the complete seminar are available by contacting Mrs. Joanne Fernandes, 2509 Foxx Creek Drive,

Ruston, Louisiana 71270; Phone 318-251-0080.

The seminar also received extensive publicity. Before the seminar there were two front page feature stories in both the *Monroe News Star* and the *Shreveport Journal*. Joanne Fernandes and Barbara Cheadle were interviewed on two television talk shows in Monroe and Shreveport. There was also good radio coverage across north Louisiana. The seminar was also on a featured news story on KNOE television in Monroe.

The seminar provided a means of educating parents and teachers about the philosophy and beliefs about blindness that are held by the NFB. The cumulative experiences and feelings held by thousands of blind adults who grew up as blind children were presented. Parents, teachers, workers with the blind, and independent blind adults had an opportunity to share and exchange ideas and feelings.

What was this seminar all about? The following thought from the seminar says it all.

Sometimes I think about how those childhood years might have been. I also think about the young people who are living my experiences right now, and about their parents who are worried and don't know what to do. If this seminar reaches you and helps any of you in one small way, those years of worry and embarrassment will have all been worth it! Parents, your children who are partially or totally blind do have the opportunity to become independent, happy and successful individuals. It is respectable to be blind.

RECIPES

by Gene Parker

(Note: Gene Parker is the wife of E. U. Parker. She is also a charming lady and a superb cook. Here are three of her recipes.)

FRESH PEAR CAKE

Ingredients: 4 cups chopped pears
2 cups sugar
3 cups flour
2 eggs
1 cup chopped nuts
1 cup oil
 $\frac{1}{2}$ teaspoon cinnamon
 $\frac{1}{2}$ teaspoon allspice
 $\frac{1}{2}$ teaspoon salt
2 teaspoons soda
1 teaspoon vanilla

Directions: Cover chopped pears with the sugar and let stand about an hour. Sift flour, spices, soda and salt together. Add pears, oil, eggs, vanilla and nuts. Stir with spoon. Mix well.

Bake at 350 degrees for 1 hour and 15 minutes in greased tube pan.

COCONUT CAKE

Ingredients: 1 Duncan Hines yellow cake mix

Directions: Bake as directed on package for two 8 inch layers. When layers are cool, slice each in half. If you do not have a sharp knife, use a strong thread for slicing the layers.

Frosting: 1 cup sour cream
1 teaspoon vanilla
1 package powdered sugar
1 cup coconut

Directions: Combine all ingredients except about 2 tablespoons of the coconut. Place cut sides of cake layers down so you will spread frosting on outside making spreading easier. Frost tops of each layer and sides of cake. Sprinkle remaining coconut on top of cake. Cake should be made a day before using in order for moisture to soak through.

ECLAIR CAKE

Ingredients: 1 box graham crackers
2 small packages French Vanilla Instant Pudding
3 cups milk
1 8-ounce container cool whip
1 can Chocolate Fudge with sour cream frosting

Directions: Cover bottom of 13½ x 9 inch dish with whole graham crackers. Mix pudding with milk and beat until thick. Fold cool whip into pudding mixture. Pour half of mixture over layer of crackers. Add another layer of crackers. Pour remaining mixture over crackers. Add another layer of crackers. Heat icing until pouring consistency and pour over last layer of crackers. Top with chopped nuts. Refrigerate at least 6 hours before serving.

MONITOR MINIATURES □ □ □ □ □

From Mr. Tandy Way, 8909 Peppermill Court, Tampa, Florida 33614:

"I have three books that I have had recorded on cassette tape that I no longer need and I hope my efforts can help someone else. For sale: *Beginning Basic, Users Reference Manual* and *Terminal Emulator 2*. These books are packaged in a nice cassette album for storage or display on your shelf. They are for use with the Texas Instruments T.I. 99/4a home computer with voice output. Recorded at standard speed and tracking. For price of any or all contact me at the above address."

Visit to the National Center:

At 7:00 a.m. on Friday, March 18, 1983, twelve members of our Dayton, Ohio, Chapter loaded their luggage and themselves into a van and headed East. Eleven hours later the van pulled up to the front steps of the National Center for the Blind.

Chapter members spent a day and a half touring their property (the National Center), purchasing aids and appliances, and talking about the accomplishments, activities, and future plans for our movement. The Greater Baltimore Chapter was meeting on March 19. Both Chapters benefited from the exchange of ideas. The

auction of a cheesecake caused a little friendly rivalry, but Mrs. Simmons' persistence gave the Dayton Chapter a delicious victory and the Maryland treasury an extra \$23.

Chapter President Sheila Samson presented Dr. Jernigan with a check for \$14,000 as a donation to the National Treasury from the Dayton Chapter. As Sheila said, "This money is to help the blind of Dayton. I know of no more efficient and effective way to help blind people in our town than to use the money to make public education video spots, to handle our activities in Congress, or to do a hundred other things nationally which will have a direct effect on the way blind people are treated in Dayton."

Several Chapter members had been to the Center before. For others it was a first visit. Chapter members who made the trip were: Mr. and Mrs. Samson, Mr. and Mrs. Kuhnwald, Mr. Ronald Williamitis, Mr. Meyers Bost, Mr. Pete Pecsoc, Ms. Julie Bolger, Ms. Denise Hopewell, and Ms. Karen Warner.

New Hampshire:

The following are the 1983 officers of the Gate City Chapter of the NFB, Nashua, New Hampshire: Edna Heaps, President; Olivette Schott, First Vice President; Christina Proulx, Second Vice President; John A. Perry, Treasurer; and David H. Brownell, Secretary. The Chapter has two paid up life members: Jane Nadeau and Jane Bedard. There are also three charter members, who have been with the Chapter for twenty-seven years: Edna Heaps, Olivette Schott, and Jane Bedard.

100th Birthday:

January 13, 1983, was the hundredth birthday of Mrs. Jane Nadeau, who is a member of the Gate City Chapter of the National Federation of the Blind, Nashua,

New Hampshire. She received a letter of congratulations from President Ronald Reagan.

Support Group:

Anyone interested in starting a support group for young blind adults who wish to achieve independence from parents please contact Steve Britt, 944 South Spring, Springfield, Illinois 62704; phone (217) 522-5422.

Bilingual Publications:

Bilingual music and/or poetry is available from Cross-Cultural Communications, 239 Wynsum Avenue, Merrick, New York 11566; (516) 868-5635, on cassette at \$10 per cassette. The National Office of the Federation will receive ten percent of all sales made to Federationists. For a complete list, write to the publisher. Be sure to mention you are a member of NFB.

From Fred Schroeder, President, National Federation of the Blind of New Mexico:

On Monday, February 28, 1983, the National Federation of the Blind of New Mexico held a Legislative Banquet at La Fonda Hotel in Santa Fe. 102 people attended, including Secretary of State Clara Jones, Senate Majority Floor Leader Mike Alarid, and 28 additional members of the New Mexico legislature. In addition, present were Mr. Oliver Ortiz, Chief of Services for the Blind; Judy Myers, Chairperson of the Governor's Committee on Concerns of the Handicapped; Mr. Jerry Wise, Director of the New Mexico Library for the Blind and Physically Handicapped; and Mr. Cipriano Esquibel, Regent of the New Mexico School for the Visually Handicapped.

The purpose of the banquet was to familiarize members of the legislature with Federation philosophy and to present our

position on state and national legislation affecting the blind.

In mid-February Representative Judy Pratt introduced House Bill 217 at the Federation's request, which would require the Governor to appoint at least one blind person to serve on the Board of Regents of the New Mexico School for the Visually Handicapped. For this reason, Representative Pratt was presented with the Legislative Service Award, which marks the first time this award has been presented by the Federation. Two days after the banquet HB 217 was unanimously passed in committee and was passed by the full House a week later with a vote of 57 to 4. We believe this represents a first step toward consumer input into the operations of the New Mexico School for the Visually Handicapped.

Mr. Cipriano Esquibel is one of the regents who was appointed this year and shows promise of being independent from the control of the superintendent. We invited him to speak at the banquet and established a positive rapport with him. The other newly appointed regent is Dr. J. Ventura Garcia, who is a blind person. Dr. Garcia helped organize the Las Cruces Chapter of the Federation.

We believe that the legislators in attendance were interested in our message and were impressed by our commitment.

- SFB Products writes us as follows:

MUSICAL GREETING CARDS
Unusual Gift

Open the card. A tiny electronic music box plays a tune appropriate to the occasion.

Birthday
Mother's Day
Wedding
Anniversary

\$3.95 each plus \$.85 shipping/handling

\$3.75 each for 2 or more. \$.85 + .20 for additional card shipping/handling

\$3.50 each for 5 or more. Regular shipping /handling: \$2.50 plus 3% of order

SPECIAL: We will send your greeting card for you. We will address the envelope and put your name and a 2-5 word greeting inside. Price includes postage. \$4.50 each

The greeting card battery will last through hundreds of repetitions. The sound is about as loud as through an ear-phone: people with normal hearing can hold it in the hand at normal reading distance and hear it well.

We anticipate having Christmas cards next fall.

We can also offer wholesale prices on quantity purchases as indicated below. This item is excellent for fundraising or for inclusion in gift shop offerings.

Wholesale:

Box of assorted cards:

12 Birthday
8 Mother's Day
2 Wedding
2 Anniversary

Retail value at \$3.95: \$94.80

Retail value at \$4.25: \$102.00

24 cards: \$60.00 plus regular shipping: \$2.50 plus 3% of order, maximum \$7.00 (Introductory Offer: Special shipping rate \$2.50 for box of 24.)

10 dozen or more, call for quote.

SFB Products
Box A
Southeastern, PA 19399
215-687-3731 (Mary Ann)

□ From Wayne and Gloria Kerstetter, Lancaster, Pennsylvania:

March 14, 1983

Dear Dr. Jernigan:

Just a few lines to let you know that Jerry Handel was struck by a car. He was in the trauma unit for about five days, with head and internal injuries plus a compound fracture of his right leg. He is presently recuperating in a private room in the hospital. His dog guide ran home to get help. Jerry and his wife and guide dog hope to be in Kansas City for convention.

□ New Baby:

Lawrence Walter Coulter arrived in this world at 6:20 a.m., February 23, 1983. He weighed eight pounds, one and one-half ounces, and was twenty-one inches long. His mother and father (Gene and Carol Coulter) have been Federationists for many years. Carol is President of the Columbia, Missouri, Chapter.

□ Married and Moving to Maryland:

On Saturday, April 2, John W. Smith (a leader in our Nebraska affiliate) married Carol L. Albers. The two met while students at the Grace College of the Open Bible in Omaha. One week later John began working at Blind Industries and Services of Maryland, where he will be teaching in the rehabilitation program. John has been active in the Federation since he was a student at the Orientation Center in Lincoln, Nebraska. He served as President of the Nebraska student chapter and First Vice President of the state affiliate. We wish John and Carol all the best in their new life together.

□ Jerry and Cindy Handel write as follows:

"Anyone interested in purchasing Aids

Unlimited stock, please contact Jerry and Cindy Handel, 25 Pleasantview Avenue, Willow Street, Pennsylvania 17584; telephone (717) 464-2110."

□ Local Chapter Help Line:

Dorothy Grubb, President of the Lansing, Michigan, Chapter of the Federation, writes:

"On July 12, 1982, the Lansing, Michigan, Chapter of the National Federation of the Blind began operating a Help Line for newly blind people and their families.

"Prior to this time our members received twenty-five hours of extensive training under the direction of Mrs. Al Holloway who is an associate professor of social work at Michigan State University. During the first fifteen hours of training we learned how to listen and communicate with people and how to identify hidden problems. The remaining ten hours were spent in role playing situations that we might encounter and discussing ways to deal with them.

"Professional Telephone Answering Service is giving us free service for this community project. Our phone rings into their office and they in turn transfer the caller directly to one of our members on duty. This enables us to receive the calls in our own homes while the callers only have one number to call.

"There are several blind people in the community, and through this project we hope to help them live more productive and independent lives."

□ Article Published:

Rami Rabby, Secretary of the National Federation of the Blind, is not only a respected management consultant, but also an increasingly published author. One of his articles (entitled "Employment of the disabled in large corporations") appeared in the *International Labour Review* of Janu-

ary-February, 1983. In a prefatory note the journal says: "The author is a consultant in human resources management. He assists governments and corporations in implementing programmes for the disabled and advises on ways of making services and products accessible to them."

□ New York City Chapter Visits National Center:

On January 8, 1983, the New York City Chapter of the National Federation of the Blind of New York spent the day at the National Center for the Blind in Baltimore. Some three dozen members made the trip. They toured the facilities, examined and purchased aids and appliances, had lunch at the Center, and had discussions with President Jernigan and other Federationists. President Arie Gamliel presented from the Chapter a donation in the amount of \$10,000 to the National Treasury. It was a day of excitement, exchange of information, and good fellowship.

□ Baby News:

Bruce and Becca Gardner of Paradise Valley, Arizona, proudly announce the arrival of a new baby girl. Jessica Elaine Gardner came into the world on Tuesday, February 1, 1983, weighing eight pounds, one ounce, and measuring twenty inches in length. As Federationists know, Bruce is the brother of National Board Member and NFB of Idaho state President, Norman Gardner. At last report, mother, father, and baby were doing quite well.

□ Houston Lighthouse:

The Lighthouse for the Blind of Houston has apparently gone down for the final count. It will be remembered (see May-June, 1983, *Braille Monitor*) that the Houston Lighthouse lost in the Federal Court of Appeal. Its petition that the Federal Circuit Court of Appeal rehear the

matter has now been denied. Thus, the Cincinnati workshop has lost in the courts; the Lighthouse of Houston has also lost; and the Supreme Court of the United States has refused to hear the case. This would seem to mean that the workshops now have no way out. They must bargain collectively with their workers and recognize those workers as employees, not mere "clients." It would also seem to me that other workshops in the country are also now obligated to engage in collective bargaining with their employees if and when those employees choose to exercise that right. The battle has been long. It started many years ago, but it is apparently now coming to a successful conclusion. One more reason why there is and must be a National Federation of the Blind.

□ Condolences:

Our heartfelt sympathies go out to the family of Jack Feazell of Columbus, Ohio. Jack was returning home by bus from the Merchants Division Conference in Philadelphia, when he had a heart attack and died.

At the time of his death, Jack was the President of the Vendor's Chapter in Ohio. His son, Barry, and daughter-in-law, Carol, are active Federationists. We extend sincere sympathies to the Feazell family.

□ Money Making Miles:

Eve Speciner is a Federationist living in New York state. Not long ago she wrote us with an interesting fundraising project.

Most Federationists spend a lot of time and money on intercity buses. Why not keep track of that amount and write a letter to the bus company with an Associate form enclosed. Mrs. Speciner has had success in getting donations from local businesses. "People give because they know that it's important to one of their customers," she explains.

How many of us know local merchants

or larger companies who care about making their customers happy? How many of us take the time to give them an Associate form?

Materials Put Into Braille:

We have received the following letter: "C. J. David Enterprises is announcing a new service, available to Braille readers across the United States. This service is for individuals who would like materials put into Braille, but do not have a lot of time to wait. We will Braille anything except books or musical scores. The cost of this service is \$1.25 per Braille page and we will deliver within three weeks from the date we receive the printed materials, unless the customer is otherwise notified. For further information contact Connie David, C. J. David Enterprises, 1020 W. 53rd Street, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55419; (612) 823-3862."

New Baby:

Tony and Mari Burda, members of the Illinois affiliate, proudly announce the arrival of their daughter Natalie Marie, who was born Saturday, April 16, 1983. She weighed six pounds, thirteen and one-half ounces, and was twenty inches in length. Totally blind and a Registered Pharmacist, Tony is a Poison Information Specialist at the Poison Control Center at Rush-Presbyterian-St. Lukes Medical Center in Chicago.

Missouri Convention:

The following is submitted by Pauline Murphy:

March 25th, 26th, and 27th the St. Joseph Chapter of the National Federation of the Blind Missouri affiliate hosted its first state convention since becoming a chapter in 1977. Highlights of our convention this year were a heated discussion with Congressman Tom Coleman of Missouri concerning several pieces of legislation and

a memorable speech delivered by our National Representative, Jim Omvig, at our banquet.

Elected to our Executive Board were: President, Billie Weaver; First Vice President, Roy Zuvers; Second Vice President, Larry Murphy; Recording Secretary, Bill Neal; Corresponding Secretary, Pauline Murphy; Treasurer, Nick Whitney; and Members at large, Rita Lynch and Dick Morris. We feel we have elected a vivacious Board and hope to accomplish many of our goals.

From Illinois:

Tony Burda, one of the leaders of the National Federation of the Blind of Illinois, writes:

"The National Federation of the Blind of Illinois has prepared an attractive pamphlet entitled "NFB Scholarships for Blind Illinois Students," which will be circulated widely throughout our state. It has been specifically designed to more widely promote the NFB's philosophy regarding higher education for the blind, and to stimulate more active interest in our organization and its worthwhile goals, thus increasing membership."

"The brochure opens with introductory text concerning our scholarship program and philosophical views pertaining to college education for blind individuals. A systematic question and answer format immediately follows, which describes in detail the three scholarships awarded through our National Office, and one which is available to NFB members who are residents of Illinois. The final piece of helpful information in the leaflet is a mention of the availability of the book *Postsecondary Education and Career Development: A Resource Guide for the Blind, Visually Impaired, and Physically Handicapped*, which may be purchased from the National Center.

"Supplies have been sent to rehabilitation teachers, resource suppliers, and 175 college financial aid departments throughout Illinois. Press releases will be sent to various radio reading services and various newsletters and publications with a readership consisting of blind consumers.

"At the NFBI we believe this piece of literature will certainly assist us significantly as we work toward our objective of elevating the blind to the status of first-class citizenship.

"Since anyone in the Federation is free to use this information in any way which may be beneficial to the movement nationally or locally, anyone can write me for a copy: Tony Burda, 1803 South Central Avenue, Cicero, Illinois 60650; (312) 652-7968."

National Public Radio writes:

Highly produced dramatizations in the arts plus in-depth commentary and provocative ideas in the sciences and social sciences are now available on audio cassettes from National Public Radio. Sample titles include: *Father Cares: The Last of Jones-town; Two Painters; The Working Blind; Speaking of War; Correspondents of World War II; Mozart's Sisters: Women's Contributions to Classical Music*. For a sample sound sheet of some programs and a 1983 cassette catalog listing over 700 titles, write: National Public Radio—Publishing, Dept. 51, 2025 M Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036. Enclose \$2.00. Make check or money order payable to NPR."

Christmas Wreaths:

PLACE YOUR ORDER NOW! Christmas Candy Wreaths are being offered for the first time ever by the National Federation of the Blind, Black Hills Chapter in Rapid City, South Dakota. Two pounds of mixed, individually wrapped candy, tied with colorful Christmas ribbon to a wreath

shaped ring. Attached to the wreath is a pair of blunt-nosed scissors for cutting the candy of your choice. Completely edible and recyclable. COST: \$5.50 plus 50 cents postage each. MINIMUM ORDER: Six Wreaths. Orders must be placed by September 1, 1983. Write to or call the following:

National Federation of the Blind
Black Hills Chapter
P.O. Box 124
Rapid City, SD 57709
Telephone 1-605-348-8418

or

National Federation of the Blind
Black Hills Chapter
c/o Harold Pigsley
226 E. Philadelphia, Apt. 2C
Rapid City, SD 57701
Telephone 1-605-348-0817

New Arrival:

James Campbell Moynihan came into the world at 6:06 p.m., Monday, April 18, 1983. His parents (active Federationists Jim and Jana Moynihan) report that the new arrival was twenty-one and one-half inches long and weighed eight pounds, two ounces. Mother, father, and son are all doing well.

Hospitalized:

Ben Prows, the Treasurer of the NFB of Washington, was hospitalized April 14. At the time of this writing it would appear that he will have to have surgery on his back.

Surgery:

On Friday, April 1st, 1983, President Jernigan had hernia surgery at Sinai Hospital in Baltimore. He was out of the hospital and back at the office on a part-time basis two weeks later. All seems to be going well.

□ Speech Compressors:

Richard Brook, 15806 Fernway Road, Shaker Heights, Ohio 44120; (216) 752-0355, writes: For Sale—two speech compressors: rare Lexicon, Varispeech II with dust cover, microphone, warranty card, print and cassette instructions—\$450.00. American Printing House VSC Module—\$75.00. Prices include shipping.

□ From the National Library Service for the Blind and Physically Handicapped:

"Poetry" magazine has been selected for production in the NLS Braille magazine program. This print monthly, with an international audience, has been published since 1912. *Poetry* carries verses from established as well as up-and-coming poets. A recent issue included "A Physics Problem," by Kathleen Atkins; "Song After Midnight," by David Waggoner; and Margaret Benbow's "Bogeyman: 1950." For a free subscription to *Poetry* in Braille, write or call your cooperating library."

□ From Janiece Betker:

Steve and Janiece Betker of St. Louis Park, Minnesota, announce the arrival of Shannon LeAnn, born March 11, weighing 7 lb., 6 oz., 21½ inches long. Readers may recall that we adopted a son Darren last April.

□ From *Changing Times*, March, 1983:

Future Reflections

That's the title of a free magazine published for parents of blind or visually handicapped children. Dottie Neeley of St. Louis suggested the title to the National Federation of the Blind Committee on

Parental Concerns, publishers of the bimonthly magazine. Neeley, whose 8-year-old son, D.J., is a 1st-grade student at the Missouri School for the Blind, says, "Our children are future reflections. They'll reflect everything that we can do for them."

Recent issues of *Future Reflections* included articles on such topics as educational toys for blind preschool children, school textbooks and myths about blindness.

Subscriptions are free to individuals, but contributions to the NFB are encouraged. To request a subscription, write to Barbara Cheadle, Editor, Future Reflections, P.O. Box 1947, Boise, Idaho 83701.

□ New Record:

At 6:05 a.m., Friday, April 15, 1983, long-time Arizona Federationist Lee Kerr boarded a bus in Phoenix. Fifteen days, 11,500 miles, and 28 states later he arrived in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. Though there are easier ways to travel, Lee Kerr's marathon had a double purpose. He broke the Guinness record for the longest time spent on a bus and the most miles traveled. In the process he also raised money for the Federation by getting friends, relatives, fellow Federationists, and anybody else he could to pledge, based on the number of miles traveled or the number of days spent on the road. One of the highpoints of the journey was an early morning stop at the National Center for the Blind in Baltimore. Lee stayed only briefly, and then he was on his way again—to break a record, to raise funds, and to publicize the organized blind movement.

